



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/633,060	08/01/2003	Tienyu Chiu	LUC-419/Chiu 4	3584

32205 7590 03/15/2007
CARMEN B. PATTI & ASSOCIATES, LLC
ONE NORTH LASALLE STREET
44TH FLOOR
CHICAGO, IL 60602

EXAMINER

O CONNOR, BRIAN T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2616

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/15/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/633,060

Applicant(s)

CHIU, TIENYU

Examiner

Brian T. O'Connor

Art Unit

2616

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 August 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 July 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-3, 5-8, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wengrovitz (US 6,909,778) in view of Morganstein et al. (US 5,940,476 hereafter Morganstein).

With respect to claim 1, Wengrovitz discloses a method where a CTI proxy server (102 of Figure 6; column 5, line 50-57; viewed as an IP peripheral unit) receives an IP packet (92 of Figure 6; where the unit must receive an IP packet because the connecting network is an IP network) containing a request for a call feature (110, 112 of Figure 7) from provided by a PBX (96 of Figure 6); the CTI server translates the IP packet and sends it to a CTI server (98 of Figure 6; viewed as the packet line trunk unit) and the CTI server translates and sends it to a PBX (96 of Figure 6; the PBX must have a switch module) so that the request for a call feature is delivered; and the PBX system responds by providing the requested feature to an IP telephone (90 of Figure 6; column 4, lines 15-22) via a IP gateway (100 of Figure 6).

Wengrovitz does not disclose a directory database accessed by an application processor in response to the request for a call feature and does not disclose the application processor retrieving information in the directory database.

Morganstein, in a related field of invention, discloses a PBX or Centrex system (20 of Figure 1) with an application processor (30 of Figure 1; where the system server is viewed as equivalent to an application processor) and access to database (42 of Figure 1) that contains account names (106 of Figure 3a) and telephone numbers (114 of Figure 3a; column 8, lines 38-44) for identity lookup and retrieval functions (column 4, lines 23-33).

One of ordinary skill in the art would recognize the benefit of additional features for a service company by using the database and processor in the PBX of Morganstein. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the method of Morganstein with the method of Wengrovitz.

With respect to claim 2, Wengrovitz does not disclose information from a directory database.

Morganstein discloses a method where a PBX looks up and sends information (caller's name) to an application processor (236, 238 of Figure 4b).

One of ordinary skill in the art would recognize the benefit of additional features for a service company by sending the information retrieved to the IP telephone in Wengrovitz. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the method of Morganstein with the method of Wengrovitz.

With respect to claim 3, Wengrovitz discloses that the request for a call feature could be generated by another calling party (50 of Figure 4).

Morganstein discloses a method where a PBX looks up and sends information to an application processor (236, 238 of Figure 4b).

One of ordinary skill in the art would recognize the benefit of additional features for a service company by sending the information retrieved to the IP telephone in Wengrovitz. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the method of Morganstein with the method of Wengrovitz.

With respect to claim 5, Wengrovitz fails to teach that the call feature is calling name display.

Morganstein discloses a method where a PBX looks up and sends information (caller's name) to an application processor (236, 238 of Figure 4b).

One of ordinary skill in the art would recognize the benefit of additional features for a service company by sending the information retrieved to the IP telephone in Wengrovitz. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the method of Morganstein with the method of Wengrovitz.

With respect to claim 6, Wengrovitz discloses a method where a CTI proxy server (102 of Figure 6; column 5, line 50-57; viewed as an IP peripheral unit) receives an IP packet (92 of Figure 6; where the unit must receive an IP packet because the connecting network is an IP network) containing a request for a call feature (110, 112 of Figure 7) from provided by a PBX (96 of Figure 6); the CTI server translates the IP packet and sends it to a CTI server (98 of Figure 6; viewed as the packet line trunk unit) and the CTI server translates and sends it to a PBX (96 of Figure 6; the PBX must have a switch module) so that the request for a call feature is delivered; and the PBX system responds by providing the requested feature to an IP telephone (90 of Figure 6; column 4, lines 15-22) via a IP gateway (100 of Figure 6).

Wengrovitz does not disclose a directory database accessed by an application processor in response to the request for a call feature and does not disclose the application processor retrieving information in the directory database.

Morganstein, in a related field of invention, discloses a PBX or Centrex system (20 of Figure 1) with an application processor (30 of Figure 1; where the system server is viewed as equivalent to an application processor) and access to database (42 of Figure 1) that contains account names (106 of Figure 3a) and telephone numbers (114 of Figure 3a; column 8, lines 38-44) for identity lookup and retrieval functions (column 4, lines 23-33).

One of ordinary skill in the art would recognize the benefit of additional features for a service company by using the database and processor in the PBX of Morganstein. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the method of Morganstein with the method of Wengrovitz.

With respect to claim 7, Wengrovitz does not disclose information from a directory database.

Morganstein discloses a method where a PBX looks up and sends information (caller's name) to an application processor (236, 238 of Figure 4b).

One of ordinary skill in the art would recognize the benefit of additional features for a service company by sending the information retrieved to the IP telephone in Wengrovitz. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the method of Morganstein with the method of Wengrovitz.

With respect to claim 8, Wengrovitz discloses that the request for a call feature could be generated by another calling party (50 of Figure 4).

Morganstein discloses a method where a PBX looks up and sends information to an application processor (236, 238 of Figure 4b).

One of ordinary skill in the art would recognize the benefit of additional features for a service company by sending the information retrieved to the IP telephone in Wengrovitz. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the method of Morganstein with the method of Wengrovitz.

With respect to claim 10, Wengrovitz fails to teach that the call feature is calling name display.

Morganstein discloses a method where a PBX looks up and sends information (caller's name) to an application processor (236, 238 of Figure 4b).

One of ordinary skill in the art would recognize the benefit of additional features for a service company by sending the information retrieved to the IP telephone in Wengrovitz. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the method of Morganstein with the method of Wengrovitz.

3. Claims 4 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wengrovitz in view of Morganstein and further in view of Dickerman et al. (US 5,987,118 hereafter Dickerman).

With respect to claim 4, Wengrovitz and Morganstein fail to disclose that the second message is compatible with peripheral control and timing facilities interface protocol.

Dickerman, in a related field of endeavor, discloses an AIN Gateway (120 of Figure 1) that translates messages into a protocol compatible with an Intelligent Network (104 of Figure 1) and Intelligent Peripheral devices (142 of Figure 1; column 6, lines 44-56) and thus is also compatible with peripheral control and timing facilities interface protocol.

One of ordinary skill in the art would realize the benefit of added network coverage and service by using the AIN Gateway functions in Dickerman. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the method of Dickerman with the method of Wengrovitz and Morganstein.

With respect to claim 9, Wengrovitz and Morganstein fail to disclose that the second message is compatible with peripheral control and timing facilities interface protocol.

Dickerman, in a related field of endeavor, discloses an AIN Gateway (120 of Figure 1) that translates messages into a protocol compatible with an Intelligent Network (104 of Figure 1) and Intelligent Peripheral devices (142 of Figure 1; column 6, lines 44-56) and thus is also compatible with peripheral control and timing facilities interface protocol.

One of ordinary skill in the art would realize the benefit of added network coverage and service by using the AIN Gateway functions in Dickerman. Thus it would

Art Unit: 2616

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the method of Dickerman with the method of Wengrovitz and Morganstein.


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian T. O'Connor whose telephone number is 571-270-1081. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00AM-6:30PM, M-F, 1st Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hassan Kizou can be reached on 571-272-3088. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Brian T. O'Connor
March 8, 2007


HASSAN KIZOU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600